

OPINION 1106

CONSERVATION OF THE GENERIC NAME *RHOPALUM*
STEPHENS, 1829 (INSECTA, HYMENOPTERA)

RULING.- (1) Under the plenary powers, the generic name *Euplilis* Risso, 1826, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Rhopalum* Stephens, 1829 (gender, neuter), type-species, by subsequent designation by Curtis, 1837, *Crabro rufiventris* Panzer, 1799, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2060.

(3) The specific name *clavipes* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Sphex clavipes*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2638.

(4) The generic name *Eupilis* Risso, 1826, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2090.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.) 2056

In 1947 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 1: 217), Benson, Ferrière & Richards applied for the conservation of the generic name *Rhopalum* Stephens, 1829, through the suppression of its senior synonym *Euplilis* Risso, 1826. At its meeting in Paris in 1948 the Commission considered the case (1950, *Bull.* vol. 4: 413-415) but decided to defer a decision pending the production of further evidence. None was immediately forthcoming, but when the Acting Secretary in 1963 (*Bull.* 20: 81) announced the closure of all unfinished files submitted before 1959, Dr Menke, Dr Bohart and Dr Richards submitted a fresh application. This was received on 27 September 1973, was sent to the printer on 24 October 1973, and was published on 28 June 1974 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 30: 219-220.

The application was opposed by Dr M.C. Day, Dr M.G. Fitton and Dr B. Bolton (*British Museum, Natural History*), by Dr I.D. Gauld (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology*) and by Dr K. Krombein (*U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.*). Their objections were published together with the applicants' reply supported by Dr H.E. Evans (*Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado*) and by Dr A. Willink and Dr L.A. Strange (*Instituto Miguel Lillo, Tucumán, Argentina*), in *Bull.* vol. 32:

96-99. Further opposition by Krombein (*Bull.* 32: 205) was answered by Bohart & Menke (*Bull.* 33: 68). The application was supported also by Dr J.P. van Lith (*Rotterdam, Netherlands*), Dr O. Lomholdt (*University of Copenhagen*), K. Tsuneki (formerly of *Fukui University, Japan*), P.M.F. Verhoeff (*Utrecht, Netherlands*) and A.R. Gittins (*University of Idaho*).

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 1 July 1977 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 30: 219-220. At the close of the voting period the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes - fourteen (14) received in the following order: Vokes, Eisenmann*, Melville, Willink, Heppell, Mroczkowski, Binder, Corliss, Dupuis, Habe, Brinck, Ride, Bayer, Kraus

Negative votes - seven (7) received in the following order: Starobogatov, Holthuis, Sabrosky, Nye, Rohdendorf, Welch, Cogger.

*Dr Eisenmann remarked on his voting paper: "This is a close case. I vote in favour of the prior name because there is substantial and wide usage in its favour, even though majority usage apparently favours the junior synonym. If, however, a majority of the Commission should favour the application, I authorise changing my vote to facilitate exercise of the plenary powers."

A late negative vote was sent in by Dr. Alvarado. No voting papers were returned by Drs Bernardi, Lemche and Tortonese.

Other comments by members of the Commission with their voting papers were as follows:

Sabrosky: I am impressed by the amount of usage on both sides, but even more depressed by the facts cited in the application on the amount of usage of *Rhopalum* since 1935 by authors who "have chosen to ignore *Euplilis*," and also that 5 of the 6 generic names based on *Rhopalum* were proposed long after 1935 (1952-63) by authors who chose to ignore *Euplilis*. It appears then that if one ignores the Rules and publishes enough, one establishes usage that can be used to justify officially suspending the Rules. In such cases I vote to apply priority.

I am unimpressed by the use of *Rhopalum* in forming other generic names. Usually only a specialist will be concerned with all the names, and he must know both *Euplilis* and *Rhopalum* anyway, no matter which name he himself uses.

A similar situation occurs in many groups. Example: In the midges, family CHIRONOMIDAE (Diptera), competing generic names were *Tendipes* Meigen, 1800, and *Chironomus* Meigen, 1803. So we have *Cryptochironomus*, *Endochironomus*, *Xenochironomus*,

Pseudochironomus, *Stenochironomus*, and *Stictochironomus*, coexisting happily and usefully with *Dicrotendipes*, *Glyptotendipes*, *Phytotendipes*, *Microtendipes*, and *Paratendipes*, all-valid names (at least in one available classification) at generic or subgeneric levels.

Nye: As both names are in current use, the Law of Priority should be upheld.

Rohdendorf: I vote against because the case is close and it is best to follow the Code strictly and apply the general principles.

Cogger: Strong arguments have been advanced by both sides in this case, and I believe that it is inappropriate to invoke the plenary powers to overturn the Law of Priority unless the arguments for the suppression of a senior subjective synonym are based on almost unequivocal grounds of usage, stability or universality.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

clavipes, *Sphex*, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) vol. 1: 569

Euplilis Risso, 1826, *Hist. nat. Europ. mérid.* vol. 5: 227

Rhopalum Stephens, 1829, *Nomencl. Brit. Ins.*: 34

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on V.P. (77)15 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1106.

R.V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

5 October 1977